## CABINET FOR HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

\_\_\_\_\_

July 22, 2021 10:30 A.M. (All Participants Appeared via Zoom or Telephonically)

#### **MEETING**

#### APPEARANCES

Elizabeth Partin CHAIR

Nina Eisner
Steven Compton
Jerry Roberts
Catherine Hanna
Ashima Gupta
Ann-Tyler Morgan
Garth Bobrowski
John Muller
Peggy Roark
Barry Martin
Eric Wright
John Dadds
COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT

CAPITAL CITY COURT REPORTING TERRI H. PELOSI, COURT REPORTER 900 CHESTNUT DRIVE FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY 40601 (502) 223-1118

### AGENDA

1.	Call to order			4
2.	Roll Call			4
3.	Approval of minutes from the May meeting			5
4.	Election of Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary	5	-	7
5.	Old Business A. Thank you, Commissioner, for agreeing to portion of the polymer of the Hospital TAC regarding some IMDs not being paid	st		7
	by some MCOs as per Managed Medicaid 42 CFR Part 438	7	-	9
	Professional Midwives (CPMs)?  D. Request amendment to the Rural Health Clinic regulation 907 KAR 1:082 Section (1)(b)2 on page 16 to extend the time to three days for providers to sign Medicaid participant's chart. Three days would be in with her regulations and more realistic	9	-	10
	<pre>in busy clinic settings E. Reminder that we will have an update   report from DMS on maternal/infant   health at the November MAC meeting</pre>	10	-	<ul><li>11</li><li>11</li></ul>
6.	Judge Phillip Shepherd, Franklin Circuit Court, ruled in late April that the bidding process (the second one) for awarding the MCO contracts was flawed and must be rebid. What are the immediate and long- term effects of the Judge's ruling that the MCO contracts must be re-bid? How does DMS plan to proceed?	11	_	12
7.	Updates from Commissioner Lee	12	_	32

# AGENDA (Continued)

8.	Reports and Recommendations from TACs *Behavioral Health	(No	32 - 36 report) 36 - 41 41 - 43 43 - 45
	*Home Health  *Hospital Care  *Intellectual and Developmental	(No	
	Disabilities  *Nursing Services  *Optometric Care  *Pharmacy  *Physician Services  *Podiatric Care  *Primary Care	(No (No (No	report) report) report) 49 - 51 report)
9.	*Therapy Services  New Business	•	report) 52 - 57
10	. Adjourn		57

2 meeting to order. And for the roll call, Teresa, our Secretary, was not able to join us today. So, 3 Sharley, you've got your hands full right now but I 4 5 don't have a list of members. MS. HUGHES: I've got it right 6 7 here. I'll do it for you, Dr. Partin. (ROLL CALL) 8 9 MS. HUGHES: I believe you have enough for a quorum, and, Beth, there's two more new 10 11 members that are to be appointed as of July 1, but I have not received word from the Governor's Office 12 13 that they have been appointed yet. So, Barry is representing the 14 15 Kentucky Primary Care Association. 16 MR. MARTIN: Yes. I'm 17 representing the Primary Care TAC. Glad to be on board. 18 19 MS. HUGHES: Thanks, Barry, and 20 I've got the agenda up now. 21 DR. PARTIN: Thanks, Sharley. 22 Next item on the agenda is the election of the Chair, 23 Vice-Chair and Secretary. Sharley, the only nominees 24 that I saw were myself for Chair and Dr. Bobrowski

DR. PARTIN: We will call the

1

25

for Vice-Chair and Teresa for Secretary. Do we have

1	any other nominees?
2	MS. HUGHES: Yes, but first you
3	skipped over the approval of the May minutes, unless
4	you did it and I didn't hear it.
5	DR. PARTIN: So, we have
6	approval of the minutes for the May meeting. Would
7	somebody like to make a motion to approve the
8	minutes?
9	DR. BOBROWSKI: This is Dr.
10	Bobrowski. So moved.
11	DR. HANNA: Second. Cathy.
12	DR. PARTIN: Any discussion?
13	All in favor say aye. Any opposed? So moved. Thank
14	you.
15	MS. HUGHES: We do have Nina
16	Eisner has expressed a desire to be for Chair.
17	DR. PARTIN: I'm sorry, Sharley.
18	You cut out. I couldn't hear what you said.
19	MS. HUGHES: I'm sorry. I'm
20	trying to do so many things at one time here.
21	Nina Eisner has expressed an
22	interest in being the Chair. So, I have created a
23	poll. Can you all see the poll showing?
24	(MAC members confirm)
25	So, only MAC members can vote.

1	So, if you all will please cast your votes, and this
2	is anonymous. So, even I can't see who.
3	(MAC members vote)
4	MS. HUGHES: It looks like, Dr.
5	Partin, you will be the Chair.
6	DR. PARTIN: Thank you,
7	everybody.
8	MS. HUGHES: So, you can go
9	ahead and continue. If you all want to see them, you
10	can see the results there now.
11	So, Beth, go forth. I'm going
12	to mute myself and take a couple of deep breaths now.
13	Have I lost Dr. Partin?
14	MS. CECIL: No, but, Sharley, if
15	you could go ahead and put the agenda back up,
16	please.
17	MS. HUGHES: Oh, I'm sorry.
18	DR. PARTIN: Do we have any - we
19	didn't have any other nominees for Vice-Chair or
20	Secretary?
21	MS. HUGHES: No, ma'am. That
22	was it.
23	DR. PARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
24	So, then, the Vice-Chair and the Secretary will
25	remain the same.

,	
1	MS. HUGHES: Yes.
2	DR. PARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
3	Now to Old Business. I would like to thank the
4	Commissioner for agreeing to post recordings of TAC
5	and MAC meetings on the DMS website when those
6	meetings are recorded.
7	I had a number of requests for
8	this and I know people will be happy to have that
9	opportunity if they're not able to attend the meeting
10	to hear what went on.
11	We're going to follow up on the
12	request from the Hospital TAC regarding some IMD's
13	not being paid by some MCOs as per Managed Medicaid
14	42 CFR Part 438.
15	Nina, do you have anything you
16	would like to add to that or any questions?
17	MS. EISNER: Yes. Thank you. I
18	do. I did have a meeting with DMS leadership on 6/25
19	and appreciate that for the folks that are in
20	attendance but I still don't have any further update,
21	and I don't know if the Commissioner or anyone else
22	does.
23	DR. PARTIN: So, have you had a
24	resolution to this?
25	MS. EISNER: No.

1	DR. PARTIN: Do we need to keep
2	it on the agenda?
3	MS. EISNER: Yes, please.
4	MS. PARKER: This is Angie
5	Parker with Medicaid. As Nina had stated, we did
6	meet with her and Matt (inaudible) on June $25^{\mathrm{th}}$ , the
7	Commissioner and the Senior Deputy Commissioner, and
8	we did discuss the issue.
9	I know that at that point, the
10	Commissioner had talked to the one MCO in particular
11	and they were to follow up. So, my assumption is
12	that that has not occurred.
13	MS. EISNER: That's correct,
14	Angie.
15	MS. PARKER: Okay. I will
16	follow up with that. Anything else to add to that?
17	MS. EISNER: No. Thank you.
18	DR. PARTIN: Do we need to keep
19	this on the agenda for the next meeting or are you
20	going to follow up with outside meetings, Nina?
21	MS. EISNER: I'd rather leave it
22	on until it's resolved, please.
23	DR. PARTIN: I'm sorry. I
24	couldn't hear what you said.
25	MS. EISNER: I would rather

1 leave it on, please, until it's resolved. 2 DR. PARTIN: Okay. 3 MS. EISNER: Thank you. 4 DR. PARTIN: So, we'll put it on 5 for the next meeting. 6 Next up, has any work been done 7 to amend the Medicaid regulation to reimburse Certified Professional Midwives? 8 9 MS. CECIL: Good morning, Dr. Partin. This is Veronica Cecil with Kentucky 10 11 Medicaid. And first I want to say I apologize because Commissioner Lee could not be with us today. 12 13 She certainly tries to always make it to the MAC but 14 she could not be here today. So, we're going to do 15 our best to fill her shoes by several of us. With regard to this issue, what 16 17 our plan is, is this is part of an overall infant and 18 maternal health review that Dr. Theriot, as you know, 19 is moving forward with. 20 So, we have no plans until we 21 have a more comprehensive plan on what we're going to 22 do with maternal health to make any changes right 23 now. 24 So, you're welcome to keep this

on the agenda but our response is going to be that

25

1 when Dr. Theriot provides her update in November, at 2 that time, we will certainly share with the MAC what 3 our plans are. DR. PARTIN: Okay. 4 So, in 5 November, we'll know what's going to happen with the 6 CPMs as far as reimbursement? 7 MS. CECIL: That's correct, 8 because we, again, are incorporating that in a more 9 comprehensive maternal health initiative. DR. PARTIN: Okay. I'll keep it 10 11 on the agenda just as a reminder to myself to ask about that, but I understand that at our next 12 13 meeting, there will not be an answer but just to keep 14 it on the plate. Okay? MS. CECIL: Okay. Sounds good. 15 16 Thank you. 17 DR. PARTIN: Thank you. 18 Next on the agenda is to request amendment to the 19 rural health clinic regulation 907 KAR 1:082, Section 20 1) (b) 2, to extend the time to three days for providers to sign Medicaid participant's chart. Three 21 22 days would be in line with the regulations and more 23 realistic in a busy clinic setting. Where are we

with that?

24

25

Commissioner Lee had mentioned previously, it is on the list for us to amend. It's a very long list of regulations that we've had to prioritize. So, we do anticipate getting to that. Where it is on the list is probably our goal is around September.

And Jonathan Scott will be providing an update on regulations, the status of regulations on the Commissioner's update.

DR. PARTIN: Okay. I will keep that on the agenda as well and hopefully we'll have an answer in September.

And the next item is just a reminder that we'll have an update on maternal/infant health at the November MAC meeting and I'll keep that on the agenda as well just as a reminder.

And, then, finally, Judge

Phillip Shepherd of Franklin Court ruled in late

April that the bidding process which was the second one for awarding the MCO contracts was flawed and must be re-bid. What are the immediate and long-term effects of the Judge's ruling that the MCO contracts must be re-bid, and how does DMS plan to proceed?

MS. CECIL: So, appeals had to be filed by Friday of last week and there were appeals. So, we are now in that cycle of a continual

1	court case. And because there is an active lawsuit
2	on this, there's nothing more we can say right now
3	except that we're waiting for more court guidance
4	DR. PARTIN: So, was it DMS who
5	appealed? I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt
6	you.
7	MS. CECIL: No, that's okay.
8	So, the Finance Cabinet had not filed an original
9	appeal. There were multiple Managed Care
10	Organizations that filed an appeal, but the Cabinet
11	continues to evaluate its legal position.
12	DR. PARTIN: So, it's the MCOs
13	who filed the appeal?
14	MS. CECIL: They did file
15	initial appeals, yes.
16	DR. PARTIN: Okay. So, I will
17	keep that on the agenda also.
18	So, in the meantime, what are
19	we following as far as the contracts for the MCOs?
20	MS. CECIL: The current
21	contracts remain in effect.
22	DR. PARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
23	And next up is updates. I guess that's you,
24	Veronica, as well.
25	MS. CECIL: That is correct.

So, a couple of things that Commissioner Lee definitely wanted us to update you all on.

The first thing is she always likes to provide the enrollment numbers, and our weekly report shows 1,565,664 members. That's a snapshot, of course, but that's the snapshot for this week, and 1.3 million of those are in Managed Care.

The next thing is our Senate
Bill 50 which is the single Managed Care Organization
Pharmacy Benefit Manager implementation that I'm
going to shorten to MCO PBM, and we did implement
that on July 1st. MedImpact is our single MCO PBM.

I think with any new implementation, you're always going to have hiccups and we tried to be very candid and transparent that nothing is 100% perfect, but I have to say that from an evaluation perspective, we find that it was very successful.

We believe that MedImpact did just a wonderful job of when issues were identified, addressing them immediately, outreaching to pharmacies, helping to make sure that members are getting the medications that they need.

So, in terms of major systemic issues, we really didn't see any. That's not to say

that it was, again, perfect, but there are things that we're dealing with on kind of a one-to-one basis.

I think it worked the way they anticipated. There's a lot of transparency with it. We aligned the reimbursement to fee-for-service and the dispense fee to fee-for-service. I think that helped.

I think for the most part, the single PDL helped. There's still, I think, some education going on around what does that mean when a drug is on the PDL and what has to happen and that transition for members, but, again, having one PBM handling that as opposed to six I think has made it easier on the member, on the pharmacy and that certainly was one of the goals. So, I wanted to provide that update.

The other thing is the Commissioner wanted me to provide some updated data on the missed and cancelled appointments' initiative.

So, since March, we have 6,522 reports by providers, and that's a unique provider count of 209. So, we had 209 unique providers uploading information into KYHealthNet about missed and cancelled appointments.

The difficulty is that we have some general buckets that a provider can choose.

And, so, our top two buckets are Unknown and Other; but behind that, for cancelled appointments, the next reason was for just an unforeseen issue; and for missed appointments, it was forgot about appointment.

So, again, I think this is helpful for the Department and being shared with the Managed Care Organizations on how do we ensure that members are getting to appointments for the care that they need.

DR. BOBROWSKI: This is Dr.

Bobrowski. May I make a comment?

MS. CECIL: Of course.

DR. BOBROWSKI: In the dental arena, these failed and missed appointments is a huge factor. And I know going to the dentist isn't a lot of fun. It's not as fun as I told a guy yesterday of going fishing or playing with grandchildren.

We set up times for people to come in, as you all do, and, then, we'll make appropriate referrals sometimes to oral surgeons.

And the oral surgeons around here and across the state, a lot of them are booked out until October and November. And, then folks will have appointments

that we try to get them in pretty quick for surgical extractions and they just don't even show up at the specialist's office.

And we tell them, you've got to keep these appointments or you may not be able to get back in at that oral surgeon's office.

So, I just wanted to give everybody a shout-out that in the dental arena, it's a big problem but that's all I've got to say. Thank you.

MS. CECIL: Thank you.

DR. PARTIN: Veronica, did you see that question from Emily Beauregard about transportation, if transportation is an issue?

MS. CECIL: Transportation is on the list and it is - for cancelled appointments, it's about the fourth down on the list. For missed appointments, it's also about fourth on the list but pretty far behind those others.

And, again, it's unfortunate that they're getting bucketed into Unknown or Other because that doesn't give us a lot of information, and those are by far the largest buckets that providers are indicating.

And I get it because sometimes

the provider may not know, and, so, they want to report the appointment being missed or cancelled which, again, is good information for us, but being able to distill it down to exact reasons is always going to be more helpful.

I will say, Dr. Bobrowski, we have some dentists on the list but they're pretty far down. Our largest reporting is in behavioral health and in primary care. By far, those two are our largest reporting.

DR. BOBROWSKI: At our office here, we did a report of all the missed appointments, and you know how it goes in cycles. Some days you might have one or two, but, then, I think it was last Wednesday, I had eight to just not even show up.

I hate to be hard on it but a lot of offices, you miss one or two appointments and you're just dismissed. And I hate it for the people, but, at the same time, it's, like, they've got to learn to get with the program and especially when they're missing their specialists' appointments that we send them to.

I was one of the new providers,
I guess. We did it for about a month, and the other
thing is, like, a lot of offices, they're so busy

trying to still get caught up from COVID, that some of them are just saying, well, I just don't have time to do one more thing for Medicaid in terms of having their staff file that report. Even though it's not a lengthy process, it's just one more thing to do.

So, it's just a problem. I don't know. I wish we could figure out something but behavioral management is the whole key to all of this. Thank you.

MS. CECIL: Absolutely. And I see that request in the Chat and we will certainly add the link to the information about how to record those missed appointments.

 $\label{eq:def:DR.PARTIN: I'd like to make a couple of comments and observations.}$ 

First of all, in 2009, out of all Medicaid providers, that's not a very high number of provider offices reporting; but on the converse side of that, over 6,000 reports just from 209 providers is pretty significant.

And, then, the other thing about the Unknown, what we find at our clinic is that they don't show up and we can't reach them to find out why they didn't show up. So, that would go into the Unknown category and it's very frustrating.

I think some people use cell phones that they purchase at Walmart and, then, when that phone runs out of minutes, they discard the phone and you can't even reach the people. So, a lot of issues there that confound this problem, I think.

MS. CECIL: Right. I understand that. So, I'm happy to take any other questions or comments around missed appointments; but if not, we have a couple of other updates we want to provide.

We did set our open enrollment dates. We wanted to share those. It will be October  $15^{\rm th}$  through December  $1^{\rm st}$ .

Now, two other things that we wanted to provide updates on are regulations, and I'm going to turn it over to Jonathan Scott for him to update you on where we are with the regulations, and, then, Pam Smith is going to give an update on the HCBS spending plan for the American Rescue Plan funds.

MR. SCOTT: Good morning, everyone.

MS. HUGHES: Jonathan, before you start, TAC members, could you all please start your video so that you're visible. Thank you. Sorry, Jonathan.

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SCOTT: No problem. morning, everyone. I wanted to tell you that we have

So, the first one is the implementing reg for Senate Bill 50. That reg is 907 KAR 23:020 and we also filed an emergency reg on that. So, it could be our first reg that has the dual public comment hearing possibility where we could have a hearing on it next month and a hearing on the ordinary version of the reg the month after that. So, that's going on right now.

five regs right now that are filed.

That reg clarifies dispensing fees, when a dispensing fee is eligible to be reimbursed, just a little bit of a cleanup to let us smoothly implement Senate Bill 50.

We also have a group of two regs that is part of the anesthesiology under medical direction. We have recently riled a Statement of Consideration. We also amended one of the regs after comments.

Those regs are currently scheduled to be heard at the August ARRS meeting, the amended and one of them we didn't amend, and that's 907 KAR 3:005, 907 KAR 3:010, Physician Services and Physician Provider Services Reimbursement.

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

We have also filed 907 KAR 3:060 which is an ambulance provider assessment. We got some comments on that reg. So, we are currently preparing a Statement of Consideration for that that

And, then, we also have 907 KAR

1:038 that is our hearing program reg. That reg allows for individuals over the age of twenty-one to be seen by an audiologist for evaluation and testing purposes only, and we also, for all recipients, an office visit to a physician is not needed before the referral can be made to an audiologist.

we'll file by the middle of next month.

A couple of noteworthy regs that may be filed soon - 907 KAR 1:604 which is our copay reg. We will be amending that to comply with the passage of Senate Bill 55 from this last Session, and, then, 907 KAR 3:170 which is our telehealth reg which we will be amending to comply with the passage of House Bill 140.

That's all I have, just a light review of some of the regs going on. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.

DR. PARTIN: Jonathan, the second req, was that 703 KAR 3:160?

MR. SCOTT: 907 KAR 3:060 is the

ambulance provider assessment req.

2

DR. PARTIN: 907. Okay. And

MR. SCOTT: No. All of our regs

3

1

the first one is 703. Is that right?

4

5

are 907 and, then, KAR. The pharmacy reg is 23:020

6

and, then, the anesthesiology under medical direction

7

regs are 907 KAR 3:005 and, then, the other one is

8

907 KAR 3:010.

9

DR. PARTIN: Okay. All right.

10

MS. EISNER: Could you talk a

11

little bit about the telehealth regulation amendments

12

that you're expecting to make?

13

MR. SCOTT: So, we will be

14

looking to comply with House Bill 140. So, I think

15

you can expect some of the things like the

16

introduction of remote patient monitoring, the

17

originating site fee that was required by that bill.

18

There's some other

19

housecleaning where we're going to be just referring

20

21

to some other regulations, some other definitions,

22

some policy changes that are still kind of at the

23

departmental level that we are continuing to discuss

some things like that. Then, there's just a group of

24

internally. So, there will be more on that in coming

25

months.

MS. EISNER: Thank you.

MS. CECIL: And, Nina, since you asked the question, and we do want to talk a little bit about telehealth, we have some flexibility right now under the Public Health Emergency, which, by the way, as part of my update, I should have said has been extended for another ninety days. So, we were very pleased to see that the Administration took that step.

As we unwind from those flexibilities, one thing that we're going to really need to talk to the licensing boards and the professional associations about is when can an out-of-state provider deliver telehealth services to an in-state Kentuckian and how do we monitor that and track that within our system because right now some of the licensing boards aren't allowing that but we kind of have to see what happens as we move out of the current Public Health Emergency, and, then, understanding, because every licensing board is different, are we accurately capturing that because we certainly don't want to cover a service that's not appropriate.

So, if you all could be thinking about that. We have a plan to try to reach

out to the different professional licensing boards and get them involved in that conversation because communication will be key, especially from the perspective that we need to know what those boards and agencies are going to do in the future around delivering that service.

Thank you for that reg update,

Jonathan. And if there aren't any other questions

about regulations, I will turn it over to Pam to give

an update on the American Rescue Plan HCB funds.

MR. MARTIN: Veronica, this is
Barry. Has there been thought about with the
telehealth regulations maybe requiring an on-site
visit, an in-person visit every third visit or fourth
visit because that, then, would help the out-of-state
providers to have some kind of connection with the
patient because I'm also afraid that not having that
on-site or hands-on visit is going to cause a lot of
issues and also compromise care in the long run.

MS. CECIL: So, that's some of the issues we're getting into is what should we require.

And the other thing we wanted to make very clear is that we're not necessarily the arbitrator on what should be face-to-face and in

person, I mean, what should be face-to-face and telehealth. It's really the professional standards because we knew when we went to telehealth quickly in March of last year that there were some licensing boards and professional standards that had to be changed because they had required the service to be face-to-face.

And, so, what we want to make sure is what is appropriate and, so, we're having those conversations.

DR. PARTIN: Veronica, in regards to the emergency orders, since the federal order was extended for ninety days, does that mean all of the current state emergency orders will remain in place for ninety days?

MS. CECIL: So, there is definitely a difference between the Public Health Emergency and the state emergency and I don't have - I apologize - all of the information around the state emergency order; but what I can tell you from a Medicaid perspective, all of the flexibilities that we implemented were tied to the Public Health Emergency.

So, in terms of what might be happening at the state level, the Medicaid

flexibilities remain in place.

DR. PARTIN: Thank you.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$  CECIL: If there aren't any other questions around that, I'll turn it over to  ${\sf Pam.}$ 

MS. SMITH: Thank you. So, we submitted our initial spending plan and our initial narrative to CMS on July 12<sup>th</sup>. We had applied for and received approval for the initial extension as they were due originally in June; but as most other states did, we received approval for that extension.

And CMS has promised as quick of a turnaround on those as possible. Those initial narratives and spending plans were at a very high level; but to give you an idea of the priorities that we looked at, we wanted to invest in provider and workforce development, service access, crisis services, technology and transformation, and, then, also have a component of project management and administrative support as there is a significant amount of reporting that we have to do to CMS as we go through this process. There are quarterly reports due where at each time we will actually refine spending plans and give updates on the work that we're doing.

2 3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

So, for workforce and provider development, we wanted to focus on, number one, trying to help stabilize the workforce, so, looking at can we create some funds for some bonuses or for some immediate money to infuse into the providers to help stabilize the workforce, as well as looking at longer-term solutions on how can we grow the workforce, what can we do as far as training, what can we do as far as recruitment to help providers.

We have heard that they may have individuals that apply for jobs but they don't show up to the interview. So, how can we work with the providers to help with that?

Is it possible to develop a tract even within the high school system and the vocational programs that's similar to the CNA tract but that really focuses on the direct support professional. That job is a little bit different in that you really are very engaged in the individual that you're caring for and advancing what their goals are and their community integration.

Looking at technology solutions. Can we help develop a registry that would help for recruitment, and that also is on the Participant-Directed Services' side. So, it would

have one central point that if you're looking to hire an employee, that you could come and review basically on a registry individuals that have already had their preemployment screenings done and that they are looking for a job in this field to try to shorten the time that it takes.

Advancing our training.

Training is always important. We're learning constantly. So, how can we advance our training?

We wanted to look at easing the access to HCB. So, how can we strengthen our no-wrong-door approach so that when individuals come in and they apply for Medicaid or they come in seeking some type of benefit, how do we screen them to make sure that they need maybe assistance with utilities?

Medicaid pays for, how can we connect them to the social resources that will help that? How can we potentially delay the need for those more in-depth services or those skilled services? How can we help them where they are and to continue to help them to age in place, so, really looking at taking a holistic view of the individuals.

And while that's not something

We also are wanting to look at our wait list. What can we do for the wait list? We

have a significant wait list for Michelle P. How can we get the individuals that are on that wait list, are there services that we can connect them with right now that either will meet their needs or that will take care of any imminent needs until they have a spot?

We want to go back and look at our rates and our current service menu. We know that rates are an issue. We have begun the rate study. With part of the waiver redesign efforts, we want to go back and revisit that and really see what can we do to make sure that there's, number one, quality among the rates and that the rates are high enough that we can keep employees and we're not frankly losing employees to McDonald's or to Amazon.

We also want to look at our crisis services. So, how can we support the acute and transition services, some of the mobile-based crisis services, the 988 crisis response line, so, working with Behavioral Health to support that initiative and how we can help that.

We also want to do a couple of feasibility studies to look at what will it take and can we implement an SMI and an SED waiver, also looking at chronic disease management and a waiver

that would support children.

So, with those funds, we are hoping that we can do those feasibility studies to find out what services would be best, what type of funds we would need to allow us to be able to offer those funds.

So, we're hoping to hear back within a couple of weeks back from CMS; but in the meantime, we are developing an overall project plan, looking at what the next step will be immediately as soon as we hear back from CMS.

Stakeholder engagement will be a very important piece that will be strong throughout whatever projects that we do implement.

So, once we have our approval from CMS, we will begin scheduling some of those sessions with stakeholders. It will include providers and advocates, as well as individuals receiving services or individuals on wait lists and the people that support them to really get their feedback and to engage them to be with us throughout this whole process.

 $\label{eq:somethings} \text{So, I'll take any questions if} \\ \text{anybody has any questions.}$ 

DR. PARTIN: Pam, would it be

possible for you to share your document with the MAC 2 or even put it out publicly? MS. SMITH: I can. Yes. send it to Sharley to share. We are going to put it on the website. We just had not got that far yet but absolutely I can share the plan that we submitted. DR. PARTIN: Great. Thank you. MS. CECIL: And those are the updates that we had planned to share today. happy to take any questions. DR. HANNA: Veronica, I don't 12 have a question. This is Kathy. I just wanted to 13 reiterate that the overall transition to the single 14 PBM, MedImpact, has gone very well, as well as could be expected based upon what we had to do, right? So, a few hiccups but everybody 16 17 is working through it real well and I just wanted to thank the Department for Medicaid Services and also 19 MedImpact for all of their efforts at making this go forward. Thank you. MS. CECIL; Thank you so much 22 for sharing that. It is always good to hear good

I can

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

18

20

21

23

24

25

news.

DR. PARTIN: Okay. If there's no other questions, then, we will move on. Thank you

for all of that information. We appreciate it.

MS. CECIL: You're welcome.

DR. PARTIN: So, next up are reports from the TACs and recommendations, and we will start with Behavioral Health.

DR. SCHUSTER: Good morning.

Sheila Schuster, Chair of the Behavioral Health TAC.

We met on July 7<sup>th</sup> and we have

a new voting member per House Bill 53, Diane Schirmer

representing the Brain Injury Association of America

- Kentucky Chapter.

So, all seven of our voting TAC members were there. We also had representatives from Medicaid and from Behavioral Health and a big number of people from the behavioral health community.

I think I mentioned at our last report that we are working very closely with Commissioner Lee and with the data people at DMS to pull data on targeted case management and the first phase of that has been completed by the data folks.

We're focusing on adults with severe mental illness which is a group that I've probably spoken to the MAC about more often than anything, and they've identified slightly over 8,600 people that would fit our criteria of people with an

SMI diagnosis who have received targeted case management in a six-month period. So, we're very excited to actually have some data to look at what the effects of targeted case management are.

We were very pleased to have Dr. Fatima Ali on from the Pharmacy Department and we talked through the transitions, a few hiccups still on the single Formulary but certainly not what we had been experiencing before.

And apparently the transition to the new PBM has gone well, so, I appreciate that and appreciate Deputy Commissioner Veronica Cecil for kind of being a liaison there. We appreciated Dr. Ali being on.

We did have one issue around lockouts for a particular pharmacy or a provider. We had a psychiatrist who is out in the community who had some folks that were in Medication-Assisted Treatment in an agency but the prescriber changed and they got locked out because the prescriber changed. And, so, Dr. Ali was very helpful, I think, in giving him some solutions for that.

We continue to have a big problem and this is not, I'm sure, just in behavioral health but it's around dual eligibles. So, those

people who have both Medicaid and Medicare or who have Medicaid and some private insurer.

And we had several DMS staff
members that were there that were very helpful to us,
Angie Parker and Lee Guice, and I think we're making
some headway on this, but we're going to come back to
it at our next meeting just to be sure.

For a long time, people who had two payer sources, we had more trouble getting payment if they had two payer sources than if they only had one which really makes no sense.

I want to talk a minute or two about the no-show or the missed appointments because we've raised some issues of concern. We don't want Medicaid recipients, particularly those with behavioral health diagnoses, to get labeled somehow as bad clients or chronic no-shows and so forth.

So, we were asking some questions about how that data was reported to the MCOs, how frequently it was being gathered and what format it was being reported, and we're going to get a report back in September.

We also had heard from a number of providers that it was kind of clunky or not a smooth and quick process sometimes to enter the data.

So, we've asked them to look at that as well.

We're always checking on the SUD waiver for persons who are incarcerated. And, unfortunately, there's been no change because of the slowness with which CMS in D.C. is getting new staff on board.

There is a House Joint
Resolution 57 Task Force that's meeting for those of
you who are interested in what we call the benefits
cliff, people that fall off coverage without having
any way of being covered until they get another plan,
and we're very pleased that the Cabinet has pulled
together a workforce to look at that.

There are several interim committees that are of interest to behavioral health. There's one on individuals with severe mental illness. There also is the 1915(c)Home- and Community-Based Task Force that has been meeting. So, we're very pleased about that.

And we were very pleased that the ABI folks were able to sit down with leadership at Medicaid and at the Department for Aging and Independent Living and come up with some next steps on implementing some of their recommendations. You all will remember that we submitted those to the MAC

1 last meeting time. 2 So, we have no recommendations and our next meeting will be September 1st, and we do 3 appreciate having this format for talking about 4 5 behavioral health. Thank you. DR. PARTIN: Thank you, Sheila. 6 7 Next up is Children's Health. MS. HUGHES: Beth, I'm sorry. 8 9 They did not meet. DR. PARTIN: Okay. Thank you. 10 Consumer Rights and Client Needs. 11 MS. BEAUREGARD: Good morning. 12 13 Emily Beauregard. I'm the Director of Kentucky Voices for Health. 14 We met on June  $15^{\rm th}$  and we met 15 remotely using Zoom. We had a quorum present. 16 17 First, I just want to say thank you to Dr. Partin and other TAC members for making 18 19 the recommendation during May's MAC meeting to share 20 publicly the video recordings of MAC and TAC meetings when they are recorded. 21 I also want to thank 22 23 Commissioner Lee for accepting that recommendation. 24 I think this is a really great opportunity to make

MAC and TAC meetings more accessible not only to

25

members who may miss the meeting for one reason or another but also for Medicaid members and for the general public who may have a conflict during that time and need to catch up on that later.

So, I've heard that if we go to some sort of hybrid schedule where some of us meet in person, others might want to meet remotely but there may not be the equipment right now to support that, but I do hope that DMS will be able to invest in some equipment so that we can have those hybrid meetings and still have that remote option and can be recorded because I really think that it's just a great opportunity for more accessibility and transparency, and I think it's worked really well for us to have that additional option.

So, during our June meeting, we discussed a number of our usual issues that we've presented to you before - presumptive eligibility, coverage options for immigrants, updates on our 1915(c)waiver programs, SUD services and reentry supports.

We also discussed the rollout of the new single Pharmacy Benefit Manager, the PBM, as well as opportunities to expand postpartum coverage and the Home- and Community-based Services

that have been made possible through the American Rescue Plan Act.

So, we were really glad to learn more about the work that DMS is doing to improve child and maternal health through the Perinatal Quality Collaborative. I think that's very valuable.

In particular, we were excited that DMS is seriously exploring the option to submit a State Plan Amendment to extend postpartum coverage from what is currently two months postpart to twelve months. This is particularly important for moms with incomes that are just above the 138% of the Federal Poverty Level.

That's the typical cap on enrollment or on eligibility, and it's one of the many ways that we can begin to address health disparities that have been caused by systemic racism. So, we very much support that and hope that it moves forward.

After years of discussing barriers to healthy reentry, we really appreciate that DMS has created a new MAP form that people who are no longer incarcerated can use to lift their suspension status and activate their Medicaid

coverage.

This has been an issue I guess for years where people are released from incarceration but their Medicaid stays in a suspended status which means that they can't get the coverage or the services that they need to support perhaps their recovery and just generally their health.

So, this is particularly important, of course, for people who need access to behavioral health and SUD treatment.

Now, this form isn't necessary for every person who leaves incarceration. Some people, their suspension gets lifted in the way that it should initially; but for those who, the date isn't updated in the system in a timely fashion or something gets entered incorrectly, this form gives the individual or their authorized representative the ability to fix that problem.

We're not sure yet how well it's working but we're monitoring this closely, talking to community health workers and Connectors and trying to make sure that people are aware of the form.

And, finally, we discussed the rollout of the single PBM. We're really happy to

hear that so far things have been going well and we certainly haven't been hearing of issues that people have experienced yet.

I think the targeted outreach that DMS has planned for members and just the planning that has been done in advance of the rollout has probably made it much smoother than it could have gone. And, so, we appreciate all of the work that's gone into that.

I do think that because we're in this grandfather period of people having ninety days essentially since July 1st for prescriptions that have been grandfathered in that may no longer be on the Preferred Drug List, right now we're probably not seeing some of the issues that we may see at the end of that period which I think would be at the end of September.

So, we're going to be monitoring that as well. I just want to make sure that every Medicaid member knows that there could be some changes coming to that Preferred Drug List and that there may be some prior authorizations required for things that didn't require a PA in the past. So, just important information for providers to be sharing with their patients as well.

Dental TAC.

We had one recommendation from our June meeting which was that DMS customize a PBM letter targeted to impacted Medicaid beneficiaries that includes the names of medications that will now require a prior authorization.

DMS already had a letter planned but not with information about specific drugs. So, we thought including that specific information would be helpful to the member.

And, then, our next meeting date is going to be August 17<sup>th</sup> at 1:30 and we'll have new members joining us at that time and that's all I have. Thank you.

DR. PARTIN: Thank you, Emily.

DR. BOBROWSKI: Yes. This is Dr. Bobrowski. Our next meeting is August  $13^{\rm th}$ .

I know that we brought up in the past the issue of a soda tax, and the KDA has had numerous meetings on this and we have an Executive Board meeting this Saturday and this topic will be brought back up again.

So, other information will come forward on that and there's pros and cons on anything like that, especially when you're trying to maybe

change behavior but at the same time it is a tax and we would all have to pay it.

A lot of discussion this morning has been on these prescriptions and stuff, and Kentucky is not too bad just yet, but I know one thing to kind of keep on our radar is the State of Pennsylvania, it costs dentists right at \$3,000 a year just to be able to do their electronic prescriptions.

So, please, let's all work together. Don't let that happen in Kentucky. There is a fee for us to do that but it's nowhere near that.

And I did have one question for Dr. Schuster. I was going to ask you about what you felt like your outcome was when you had your meeting with the Medicaid Oversight and Advisory Committee, if that's okay to ask on a TAC report?

DR. SCHUSTER: I testified about the suspension of prior authorizations for behavioral health and there was no action taken because they're in the Interim Session, Dr. Bobrowski, so, they can't do anything, but certainly the comments from I think almost every one of the members of what we call the MOAC, the Medicaid Oversight and Advisory Committee,

was very positive about maintaining those
suspensions.
The recommendation I made was

The recommendation I made was that they be maintained at least until the end of the year when we're kind of out of the COVID impact hopefully and we have some more of this data that we're collecting. So, thank you for asking.

DR. BOBROWSKI: That is all the Dental TAC has to report for today. Thank you all.

DR. PARTIN: Thank you. Nursing Home.

DR. MULLER: It's John Muller.

Our TAC Chairman, Terry Skaggs, had an unexpected

emergency. So, I'm the MAC member but I'd like to at

least read this in for Terry.

The Nursing Home TAC met on Wednesday, June 30<sup>th</sup>, attended by most of the TAC members. Agenda items discussed included whether or not future meetings are virtual versus the in-person and we will keep going forward with the virtual format.

The Department for Medicaid provided an update on the funds paid to date for the \$270 COVID add-on per day and the additional bed reserve payments that were part of the COVID

emergency.

TAC members were also able to confirm the normal rate inflationary adjustments that will be made to the price of 1.09% and 2.5% for the capital and the non-capital components respectively effective July  $1^{\rm st}$ , '21.

TAC members also discussed the efforts made by the Association to affect changes to Medicaid eligibility, the policy to more closely align with the way other states grant Medicaid eligibility for long-term care. DMS agreed to review the documents provided by the TAC and have responded to the Association and we are going to work together to adopt the policies where practicable.

We also discussed the new hybrid, very important to us, level-of-care process that would include obtaining a sample of residents and, then, a 90% or more accuracy threshold, and if we pass the threshold, level-of-care testing would only occur once per year.

After discussion, the TAC had several questions regarding this new Carewise level-of-care implementation including what action is going to occur if the facility does not meet the 90% accuracy of the sample. Will the facility be

provided a list of the sample residents prior to the onsite review?

And as of the initial approval, after review of the KLOCS' information, we only have a 30-day window. If reviews are only going to be yearly, we need it clarified, how will the extension process work if it's several months between the required assessment of the KLOC and, then, the yearly review?

DMS answered the questions during the TAC but we are going to need further followup at our next TAC meeting from DMS on those.

And, lastly, we had a discussion of the MAP-350 provider letter implementation. We greatly appreciate the Department's removal of the requirement to obtain signed and dated signatures annually and also had a discussion of what's going to happen to Medicaid recertifications once the PHE ends if we, as noted earlier, have a bit more time with the extension signed earlier this week.

That concludes Chairman Skaggs' report from the Nursing Home TAC. Thank you.

DR. PARTIN: Thank you. Home Health.

1 MS. HUGHES: The Home Health TAC 2 did not meet, Dr. Partin. 3 DR. PARTIN: Okay. Thank you. 4 Hospital. 5 MR. RANALLO: This is Russ 6 Ranallo, Chair of the Hospital TAC. 7 The Hospital TAC met on June 8 We had a quorum. We don't have any 9 recommendations. Some of the items that we 10 talked about, we talked about the WellCare short stay 11 12 policy. WellCare put out a policy that was approved 13 by DMS that basically said, outside of a few 14 exceptions, anytime a patient came in to the hospital 15 and had any stay less than two days, they were to be considered observation regardless of whether they met 16 17 the medical necessity criteria to be an inpatient. 18 Numerous hospitals, once they 19 saw the policy, had issues and questions. For 20 example, it wasn't clear what populations the policy applied to. OB and newborn very often have a stay of 21 22 two days or less and would they be observation and 23 not inpatients? 24 The policy was rescinded, sent

back to WellCare. WellCare revised the policy and

sent it back to DMS and we raised concerns that the policy was against information in the regulation but also maybe in the contract between WellCare and the State.

The Hospital Association had a meeting after the TAC meeting with DMS and went over our concerns. The policy is still in draft form, as I understand it.

We talked about the WellCare NICU policy, another policy where WellCare would reduce outlier payments when the hospital billed a level of care that did not match the level of care authorized or approved by the WellCare vendor, Progeny.

We talked about the administrative burden and the reduction of payments and that no other MCO or really any other insurance plan has this type of policy for an inpatient baby.

The psych hospital EMTALA requirements, you heard that earlier in the meeting. The other items, we agreed to continue to Zoom meet for the remainder of the year and, then, Bud Gorman with KHA talked about the KHA Patient Transport Committee.

Large parts of the hospitals

1	are reporting having issues with non-emergent
2	transport and getting patients to the proper level of
3	care resulting in delays of care on occasions and
4	also using transports that are more expensive,
5	whether it's fixed wing or helicopter.
6	The next Hospital TAC meeting
7	will be August 24 <sup>th</sup> . Thank you.
8	DR. PARTIN: Thank you. Next
9	up, Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities.
10	MS. HUGHES: They did meet but
11	there were no recommendations. I haven't seen
12	anybody on here to tell you that.
13	DR. PARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
14	Nursing TAC.
15	MS. HUGHES: They did meet last
16	month. It was more of an organizational meeting and
17	appointing the Chair and so forth. So, they didn't
18	have any actual report to make today.
19	DR. PARTIN: Thank you.
20	Optometry.
21	DR. COMPTON: Steve Compton. We
22	have not met since the last MAC meeting. We're
23	scheduled to meet again on August $5^{th}$ . So, we have
24	no report.
25	DR. PARTIN: Thank you.

1 Pharmacy. 2 MS. HUGHES: Pharmacy did not 3 meet either. 4 DR. PARTIN: Okay. Physician 5 Services. 6 DR. McINTYRE: This is Dr. 7 William McIntyre. I'm Vice-Chair of the Physician 8 TAC. 9 We met six days ago, July 16<sup>th</sup>. We had a number of discussions. We're going to have 10 11 in-person meetings every third meeting. So, the next in-person meeting that we'll have will be in 12 13 November. We discussed the soda tax; and 14 15 while we don't have a recommendation on that, we want 16 Dr. Bobrowski and his TAC to know that the Physician 17 TAC fully supports using a soda tax to try and influence consumer behavior to reduce the intake of 18 19 soft drinks. 20 We do have one recommendation. 21 We discussed Medicaid limits on complex evaluation 22 and management office visits in chronic care 23 management, and there's a KAR regulation, 907 KAR 24 3:010(10), and this regulation limits Level 4 and

Level 5 office visit reimbursement.

The regulation says that 99214 and 99215 shall be limited to two per recipient per provider per calendar year.

Our concerns are, first of all, the reimbursement for those levels is already well below the reimbursement for the same levels by surrounding states.

And, second, physicians and other providers have to learn the CPT codes, apply them correctly and that's frustrated by having the CPT codes automatically reduced if it's been more than two visits in that calendar year that have had those higher levels.

Also, a lot of our patients are elderly. Their care is complex and having the limits on the codes that are used, the code for those complex visits defeats the purpose of having those codes in the first place.

And, third, with the limited reimbursement for those codes and with the limitation on only having two of those high Level 4 and Level 5 visits a year, this interferes with the efforts to recruit physicians to come in to the state.

So, our recommendation is that the limits to two Level 4 and Level 5 visits a year

1 per recipient, that that be eliminated and that sums 2 up our meeting and our recommendations. 3 DR. PARTIN: Okay. Thank you. 4 Next up is Podiatry. 5 MS. HUGHES: They did not meet. 6 DR. PARTIN: Okay. Primary 7 Care. MR. MARTIN: This is Barry 8 9 Martin. I'm a member of the Primary Care TAC, and our Chair, Mike Caudill, was unable to participate in 10 the MAC call. So, I will give the report. 11 We met on July 1st and we did 12 13 not have any recommendations. However, we did discuss having a hybrid meeting for our next meeting 14 15 where we would have the option to meet in Frankfort at the Kentucky Primary Care Association office for 16 17 the TAC members or have it via Zoom and, then, we would meet via Zoom with the DMS members for our next 18 meeting which is September 2<sup>nd</sup>, and that's all I have 19 20 to report. 21 DR. PARTIN: Okay. Thank you. And last, Therapy Services. 22 23 MS. HUGHES: They did meet but

it doesn't appear that there's anyone here from that

TAC but there were no recommendations.

24

	1
1	DR. PARTIN: All right. There
2	were none?
3	MS. HUGHES: There were none,
4	no, ma'am.
5	DR. PARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
6	So, that concludes the reports and recommendations
7	for the TACs.
8	Would somebody like to make a
9	motion to accept the recommendations?
10	DR. GUPTA: I move. Dr. Gupta.
11	MR. WRIGHT: Second. Eric
12	Wright.
13	DR. PARTIN: Any discussion?
14	All in favor, say aye. Any opposed? Okay. The
15	recommendations are accepted.
16	Then we move on to New
17	Business. Before we do New Business, Deputy
18	Commissioner Cecil had something else she wanted to
19	report to us.
20	MS. CECIL: Thank you, Dr.
21	Partin. I can't believe I forgot to mention this,
22	especially with the discussion around Senate Bill 50,
23	but I did want to announce that Dr. Fatima Ali who
24	has been serving as an Associate Pharmacy Director
25	has been essentially named our Acting Pharmacy

Director.

And I can assure you that the success of Senate Bill 50 is due to her hard work. I really can't take any credit. She was just amazing and phenomenal and made sure that things went smoothly.

So, I just wanted to announce to everybody that Dr. Ali will be stepping in as Acting Pharmacy Director, and we do plan to hire two Clinical Managers that will help us manage both the Managed Care side and the fee-for-service side. Thank you.

DR. PARTIN: Thank you. To New Business, I have two items under New Business.

One, I was wondering if DMS can tell us, of course, not today, but give us some idea about the COVID vaccination rate for Medicaid recipients. Would that be possible?

MS. CECIL: Absolutely. We are tracking it and, you're correct, I don't have it at the top of my head right now but we are absolutely tracking it. I'll be more than happy to provide that.

DR. PARTIN: Okay. So, I'll put that on for the next meeting.

1 And, then, the next item for New Business is to discuss whether we want to 2 continue the Zoom meetings or in-person meetings or 3 some kind of mixture of that. 4 5 I would like to recommend at 6 least for our next meeting that we continue with Zoom 7 just because of the Delta variant surging right now, but I'm open to any discussion or comments on that. 8 9 MR. ESSEK: If I may. I'd like to see at least a hybrid type of meeting. 10 DR. PARTIN: I couldn't hear 11 I heard that you said some kind of hybrid. 12 13 MR. ESSEK: Yes, ma'am. 14 Essek, Peer Support. I would like to see some type of hybrid meeting where even if it's in-person, that 15 there be a Zoom component of it. 16 DR. PARTIN: Is that possible, 17 Deputy Commissioner? 18 19 MS. CECIL: We've expressed this 20 with each of the TACs that we are concerned about the 21 availability of meeting rooms that can accommodate 22 both an in-person and a virtual. 23 Part of that is because, as you 24 noted with the variant, we remain concerned about

having the availability for as many people that want

to attend in person and ensuring the safety.

So, we're certainly leaving it up to you all to make the decision on what you want to do and we'll work towards that. We do need, I think, some time to figure that out if we wanted to move to a hybrid, and I do recommend a hybrid because, as you can see with the number of attendees we have today, this has certainly opened up the

So, if we wanted to move to hybrid, I'm not sure if we could do it by the next meeting but certainly we'd be happy to work towards that.

ability for more participation which is wonderful.

DR. PARTIN: Okay. So, as far as the MAC goes, for our next meeting, are you all in agreement that we meet virtually for our next meeting?

(TAC members in agreement)

DR. PARTIN: Okay. And, so, we can discuss that further, then, at our next meeting in September of how we want to proceed. Does that sound okay to you all?

(TAC members in agreement)

MS. HUGHES: Dr. Partin, one other thing, too, is that the meeting room that you

all were using, if all the MAC members attended, was crowded to get you all all at the table and you've had three new MAC members added.

So, I'm going to have to probably find another room for you all when you do come back to in-person that will seat all the MAC members at the table. I don't need to be at the table and we'd have to move the court reporter also and we will wouldn't have enough seating there for everyone.

So, I'll have to work on finding us a meeting room large enough.

DR. GUPTA: Dr. Partin, may I make a suggestion just because we don't know about the Delta variant and winter is going to be approaching and things like that. Could we just keep it virtual through the January meeting, and, then, at the January meeting, decide how to proceed further?

DR. PARTIN: I think that's an excellent idea.

DR. GUPTA: Just also with scheduling patients and things like that, it would make it a lot easier to know in advance exactly what we're doing for the next few months.

DR. PARTIN: I agree. Does the

Τ	rest of the Council agree with that?
2	(MAC members in agreement)
3	DR. PARTIN: Okay. So, we will
4	continue with our virtual meetings through this year
5	and, then, at our next meeting in November, we will
6	discuss what we want to do as far as moving into
7	2022.
8	Anything else? Okay. Does
9	somebody want to make a motion to adjourn?
10	MS. EISNER: I make that motion.
11	MS. ROARK: I second it.
12	DR. PARTIN: Thank you, Nina and
13	Peggy. All in favor? So moved. See you all in
14	September.
15	MEETING ADJOURNED
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	